



TITLE IX COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT

**University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
Computer Science and Engineering**

March 2023

Office of Equity and Civil Rights

www.nsf.gov

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

TITLE IX COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT

**University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
Computer Science and Engineering**

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 4

II. SCOPE 4

III. COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT 5

 A. *Role of the Title IX Coordinator* 5

 Analysis

 NSF Recommendation

 Promising Practice

 NSF Finding

 UM Response

 B. *Adoption of Grievance Procedures and Policy Dissemination* 8

 Analysis

 NSF Recommendation

 Promising Practice

 NSF Finding

 UM Response

 C. *Recruitment, Admissions, Enrollment, and Faculty Recruitment* 10

 Analysis

 NSF Recommendation

 Promising Practice

 NSF Finding

 UM Response

 D. *Program Administration and Environment* 12

 Analysis

 NSF Recommendation

 Promising Practice

 NSF Finding

 UM Response

IV. CONCLUSION 14

I. INTRODUCTION

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits recipients of federal financial assistance from discriminating on the basis of sex in educational programs or activities.¹ The goal of Title IX is to ensure that Federal funds are not utilized for and do not support sex-based discrimination, and that individuals have equal opportunities, without regard to sex, to pursue, engage or participate in, and benefit from academic, extracurricular, research, occupational training, employment, or other educational programs or activities.² Title IX regulations and the National Science Foundation's (NSF) authorizing legislation provide for periodic review of grant recipients' practices to assess whether they are consistent with the regulations.³

NSF selects awardee organizations for compliance reviews based on multiple factors including number of active NSF awards, amount of funding received, geographic location, and discipline area of previous site visits. Previous or active allegations of discrimination or harassment, including sexual or sex-based harassment are also considered in selecting a compliance review site.

NSF selected the University of Michigan (UM or the University), College of Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering Division (CSE) for a Title IX compliance review due in part to concerns of an organizational climate tolerant of sexual harassment, as reported in the media and from communications received from the public.⁴ In addition to the communications received, NSF based its selection on the number and total dollar amount of NSF awards, the type of program receiving awards, and the geographic location of the recipient institution.

II. SCOPE

As articulated in a letter on May 25, 2022, from NSF's Office of Equity and Civil Rights (OECR) to the President of the University, this Title IX Compliance Review was intended to assess 1) the University's nondiscrimination policies and procedures related to Title IX; 2) its grievance and discrimination complaint processes, and 3) the role of the Title IX Coordinator in implementing and enforcing Title IX requirements. The review also considered whether 4) the University's procedures provide for the prompt and equitable resolution of Title IX complaints, and 5) whether there is compliance with the notification and dissemination requirements of Title IX.

¹ 65 Fed. Reg. 52, 859 (Aug. 30, 2000)

² *Ibid.*

³ 65 Fed. Reg. 52,859 (Aug. 30, 2000); 45 C.F.R. § 618.605, 611.7; 42 USC 1861 et seq.

⁴ See, e.g., Samantha Rich, "Peter Chen Returns to Teach Following Not Guilty Verdict", *Michigan Daily* (January 13, 2023); Eric Gilbert, "A Faculty Perspective on Reporting Sexual Misconduct", *Michigan Daily* (November 10, 2022); Riley Hodder, "United States District Judge Approves Settlement in Sexual Misconduct Lawsuit, establishes Coordinated Community Response Team", *Michigan Daily* (August 4, 2022); George Weycamp, Sammy Sussman, Nina Molina, "Walter Lasecki Resigns Effective August 30 Amid New Sexual Harassment Allegations", *Michigan Daily* (May 28, 2021); George Weycamp, "Survey Among Computer Science Department Shows Disparities in Feeling Valued and Supported", *Michigan Daily* (September 7, 2021); Zoe Schiffer, "Michigan Computer Science Faculty Calls for Jason Mars to Take a Leave of Absence Following Verge Investigation", *The Verge* (February 14, 2020); Derrick Taylor, "University of Michigan Suspends Provost Following Sexual Misconduct Allegations", *The New York Times* (January 23, 2020); Liat Weinstein, "Study Finds Gender Balance Among Computer Science IAs Despite Unbalanced Gender Ratios in Classes", *Michigan Daily* (March 26, 2019).

In conducting this review, NSF consulted information provided by the University in response to our request on May 26, 2022, and any relevant information and documents provided subsequently. NSF conducted an onsite review at CSE on March 28-30, 2023, during which the NSF review team, comprised of representatives from OECR, Office of the General Counsel, and the Computer and Information Science and Engineering Directorate, interviewed 43 CSE administrative staff, Department Heads, faculty, graduate students, and University administrators involved in the implementation of Title IX requirements. Due to the abbreviated nature of the site visit and the relatively small number of interviews in relation to the program size, NSF's resulting report should not be considered a comprehensive examination, and NSF recognizes that follow-up engagement may be needed in the future.

This report includes recommendations from NSF provided to strengthen the University's and/or CSE's existing compliance program, and, where applicable, NSF has highlighted promising practices consistent with enhanced Title IX compliance that are currently being implemented by the University and/or CSE.

III. COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT

A. Role of the Title IX Coordinator

NSF reviewed the University's policies and practices regarding Title IX regulations stating that a recipient must designate an official responsible for Title IX coordination and enforcement, i.e., a "Title IX Coordinator," and disseminate the Title IX Coordinator's contact information to the recipient's academic community:⁵

Below is the name and contact information for the UM Title IX Coordinator at the time of the site visit.

Elizabeth Seney
Director of Sexual & Gender-Based Misconduct / Title IX Coordinator
Equity, Civil Rights & Title IX Office
(734) 763-0235
elefond@umich.edu

Analysis: The University's Title IX Coordinator is a member of the Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX Office (ECRT), which is led by an Executive Director and Special Advisor to the President. Per the University of Michigan's *Policy on Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct* (October 1, 2021), the Title IX Coordinator is responsible for ensuring compliance with Title IX and serves as the individual on campus to whom reports of possible prohibited conduct are made. The Title IX

⁵ See 45 C.F.R. § 618.135(a). See also DOJ, "Questions and Answers Regarding Title IX Procedural Requirements" (hereafter referred to as "Title IX Q&A"), accessed at <<http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/cor/coord/TitleIXQandA.php>>; OCR, Dear Colleague Letter on Title IX Coordinators, April 24, 2015, accessed at <<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201504-title-ix-coordinators.pdf>>; OCR, *Title IX Resource Guide*, April 2015, accessed at <<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-title-ix-coordinators-guide-201504.pdf>>; OCR, "Q&A on Campus Sexual Misconduct," September 2017, accessed at <<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/qa-title-ix-201709.pdf>>.

Coordinator is responsible for oversight of responses to all reports of possible prohibited conduct under this Policy, including supportive measures, resolution processes, and other University action taken in response to a report.

Information about Title IX is disseminated largely through the ECRT website which was reportedly recently updated and revised for user friendliness. The website contains policies, procedures, and guidance regarding how to make a misconduct report, contact information for ECRT team members and introductory videos regarding ECRT and the Title IX Coordinator. NSF was told that ECRT is launching a media campaign (ads, hard copy flyers with housing, student life, campus buildings, digital signage, etc.) to make sure “people know who they are and where to find them.”

With regard to the effectiveness of information dissemination regarding the Title IX Coordinator and the requirements of Title IX, NSF found that most of the CSE Division faculty, staff, and students interviewed for this review were generally familiar with the Title IX Coordinator’s role, although there was some uncertainty about who the Title IX Coordinator was and the name of the Coordinator’s office. Most offered that they knew to consult the ECRT website for information about resources and how to make a report.

Another critical responsibility of the Title IX Coordinator is to provide training to all members of the school community, including faculty, staff, and students.⁶ While NSF regulations do not require such training, the Foundation views training as an important element to educating the campus community of their rights, responsibilities, and contributions to eliminating sexual harassment and discrimination. As of May 2019, all faculty, staff, and students are required to take a fifteen-minute online module entitled “Cultivating a Culture of Respect: Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Awareness.” Bystander training is provided to all incoming students. Training is also offered regarding “Individuals with Reporting Obligations.” Other training is available upon request through the ECRT Prevention, Education, Awareness and Resources (PEAR) Office. CSE has a number of online trainings available to its community, including “Reporting Sexual and Gender Based Misconduct at Michigan”, “Unconscious Bias” and “Improving Workplace Climate.”

While the University informed the NSF review team that Title IX training was mandatory for all students and faculty, most CSE students interviewed did not recall the training and faculty were confused about whether training was mandatory and how often it was required. It was unclear that training beyond onboarding was enforced.

NSF Recommendation: Title IX training should resonate with its intended audiences, including CSE students and faculty, with regular updates, enhancements, and refreshers, e.g., annually. Considering the spotty awareness about and recall regarding Title IX training expressed by almost all interviewees, we would recommend that the University take steps to invigorate this training and to clarify the requirements.

Promising Practice: The one Title IX related training session we heard about with notably enthusiastic reviews was the “Moving the Needle Training” presented by the Center for Research Learning and Teaching (CRLT) Players. This live training, “challenges participants to expand their

⁶ OCR, *Title IX Resource Guide* at 2-3.

understanding of what sexual harassment is, how it impacts individuals and communities, and what they might do to alter the permissive status quo of institutional spaces.”⁷ Attendees we interviewed characterized it as relevant, engaging, and memorable. The fact that it was in person and the CSE attendees experienced it as a community seemed particularly significant to those we interviewed. Several interviewees commented that they would appreciate a repeat performance or having the CRLT Players develop a refresher session.

NSF Finding: *In Compliance*

UM Response: The University agrees, emphatically, with the NSF that training is an integral part of compliance, culture, and of a successful Title IX program overall. Considerable resources have gone into training the University community generally, and CSE specifically, on matters related to Title IX and sexual misconduct.

The *Moving the Needle Training* presented by the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) Players has been enthusiastically received by many in the College of Engineering (“CoE”). Over the course of summer and fall 2023, this course content was transferred from the CRLT Players to The Prevention Education, Assistance and Resources (PEAR) department within the Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX Office (ECRT)⁸ so that a workshop version of the training can be offered more regularly, and ongoing by request. Additionally, PEAR, along with CRLT, will offer an extended Moving the Needle session for academic leaders in May 2024. This includes an online course followed by a ½ day in-person session.

In addition to *Moving the Needle*, a number of other trainings and restorative circles/facilitated dialogues have been provided by the ECRT/PEAR department for CoE. From January through November 2023, these included:

PEAR Trainings, CoE, 01-11/2023: 13

PEAR Restorative Circles/Facilitated Dialogues, CoE, 01-11/2023: 6

Additional PEAR Consultation Individual Contacts, CoE, 01-11/2023: 28

Many of PEAR’s additional offerings include: Introduction to the Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct Policy, Understanding Reporting Obligations, Bystander Intervention, How to Respond Compassionately to Disclosures, and Creating Healthy and Resilient Workplaces.

In addition to ECRT sponsored trainings, The Culture of Respect online module by Organizational Learning is required for all new University employees.

⁷ CRLT Players: Moving the Needle on Sexual Harassment Series. <https://crlt.umich.edu/crltplayers/moving-needle-shifting-conversation-around-sexual-harassment>

⁸ PEAR opened in the fall of 2022 and provides a range of sexual and gender-based misconduct prevention resources for faculty, staff and administration. [The PEAR team](#) offers presentations, workshops, and professional development for Ann Arbor and Michigan Medicine faculty, staff and administration. PEAR also offers consultations with faculty and staff leaders and assists units as they holistically respond to the complex needs of their communities. PEAR Specialists support a portfolio of schools and colleges. [Rachel Roth Sawatzky](#)'s portfolio includes North Campus including the College of Engineering.

Within the CoE, the College has instituted a system for automatically capturing education and training activities that faculty participate in. These include Title IX-related training events as well as a broader category of workshops and presentations involving DEI issues.

In the CSE Department, faculty are required to submit an annual report – the Faculty Activity Report (“FAR”) -- documenting contributions and accomplishments over the past year and reviewed by the department as part of determining merit raises. The FAR now includes a DEI section, enumerating the relevant activities tracked by the College, plus any additional activities entered by the faculty member. Faculty are also asked to reflect on how their engagement with these topics is incorporated in their teaching, research, and service.

B. Adoption, Implementation and Dissemination of Grievance Policy and Procedures

Title IX regulations require that recipient institutions that provide education programs adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of student and employee complaints and take specific and continuing steps to notify the relevant communities of these procedures.⁹

Analysis: OECR reviewed the University’s Title IX policies and grievance procedures. As a result of the revisions to the US Department of Education’s (ED) Title IX regulations that were effective since August 14, 2020, many NSF awardee organizations who also receive funding from ED were required to develop and implement revised policies and grievance procedures. OECR found that the University has implemented the Policy on Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct for sexual misconduct covered by both ED and NSF Title IX regulations¹⁰. Sex discrimination that is not sexual or gender-based harassment is covered under the University’s Non-Discrimination policy¹¹. The University’s grievance procedures as written address the considerations identified by the Department of Justice and ED’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) as necessary to meet the Title IX regulatory standard of “prompt and equitable.” Further, the University meets the Title IX notice requirement by posting notice of its commitment to equal opportunity regardless of sex on its Title IX webpage, and in its student catalogues and applications in connection with recruitment of students and employees, as provided for in OCR guidelines.

Title IX also requires federal grant recipient institutions to ensure that their policies and procedures are disseminated and made available to students, faculty, and staff. In this regard, the University maintains a hyperlink on its website landing page to Report Sexual and Gender Based Misconduct, requiring no searching for office webpages. Once accessed, the link leads to helpful information about reporting, education and training and resources for both faculty, staff, and students. According to the University’s August 2021 “Toward the Future Survey” results report, a large number of CSE students were unsure about the policies and procedures surrounding sexual assault, sexual misconduct, and reporting these issues. The same was generally true of the student and

⁹ See, Designation of responsible employee and adoption of grievance procedures, 45 C.F.R. § 618.135(b), and Dissemination of policy, 45 C.F.R. § 618.140.

¹⁰ <https://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.89-1>

¹¹ <https://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.35>

faculty members we interviewed during our site visit. Most reported that they knew they could find the necessary information and guidance on the University's website.

During the timeframe of this review (the past five years), the University indicated that there were thirteen instances of informal consultations regarding sexual harassment and four involving sexual assault within CSE. Six sexual harassment matters, two sexual assaults, and one retaliation matter were formally investigated, and two sexual assault matters were formally resolved. Several of these matters, both formal and informal, involved a single faculty member respondent and several faculty and student complainants, making numerous allegations over time. With respect to the formal matters, what was then the Office of Institutional Equity, divided the allegations into separate cases by complainant. There seemed to be confusion, expressed by complainants in the media, and by several of those interviewed by NSF as to why the complaints were treated as such, even if permitted by the procedures.

In addition, the apparent failure to address behaviors that were not found to be violations but had raised wide-spread concerns has led, in our view, to fostering a skepticism within CSE about the Title IX Office. In one such complaint, after analyzing evidence and determining that the faculty member was not responsible for committing sexual harassment, OIE made a finding that the evidence obtained by OIE did not suggest that the faculty member did or reasonably should have understood any such behaviors, to the extent they may have occurred with the complainant, to be unwelcome since, for example, the complainant never informed the faculty member that the behaviors were unwelcome during or after the alleged incidents and acted as if nothing ever happened in communications they exchanged just after an incident. A complainant being provided with such a finding could argue that a respondent should know that some behaviors may be considered or assumed to be universally unwelcome and therefore not require "real-time" assertions to a respondent that the behaviors are unwelcome. Moreover, this finding was made without an explanation as to why the faculty member would not consider these behaviors with the complainant to be unwelcome. OECR recommends that the University provide more analysis in future sexual misconduct complaint investigations on how alleged sexual misconduct could not be considered unwelcome by a respondent or a definition of "unwelcome".

NSF Recommendation: NSF echoes the recommendation of CSE's independent "Towards the Future Survey" results report for CSE to continue to:

"re-publish through multiple networks, the procedures for investigation of alleged sexual misconduct and the rights of each party involved in an investigation. Encourage faculty, staff, and students to learn and understand the procedures by putting on additional programs and sending additional information to each member of the community. Place posters regarding the information in all public spaces. Work with student news sources to ask that they publish the procedures and rights. Further develop social media sources for educating about procedures and rights."

Promising Practice: CSE now has a "Reporting Concerns and Misconduct" webpage¹² containing straightforward instructions on how to report misconduct, how to access a supportive conversation

¹² <https://cse.engin.umich.edu/community/reporting-concerns-and-misconduct>

within CSE, and where to go on campus for confidential support. The site allows CSE community members to submit anonymous, encrypted messages directly to CSE leadership as well as information and links for filing formal complaints with ECRT and contact information for the Division of Public Safety

NSF Finding: *In Compliance*

UM Response: It goes without saying that without community knowledge, no Title IX program will be successful. Our extensive efforts are wasted if few people know about and can benefit from them. ECRT takes several measures to publish its policies, programs and to otherwise be accessible to the community. In addition to what the NSF has highlighted, efforts include:

- a) ECRT plans to send an email to the entire University Community in January 2024 and September 2024, at the beginning of each semester, with information about the procedures for reporting sexual misconduct.
- b) ECRT continues to refine its report writing to include a thorough analysis and explanation of its reasoning and findings, and to otherwise appropriately respond to feedback. ECRT will better inform all complainants and respondents that if they have questions about the process or about a completed report, they will have a contact at ECRT to assist them.
- c) The Title IX Coordinator holds regular office hours that are open to all members of the University community.

C. Recruitment, Admissions, Enrollment, and Faculty Recruitment

NSF reviewed CSE's practices regarding Title IX regulations stating that recipients may not discriminate on the basis of sex in admissions and recruitment.¹³

Analysis: According to CSE, primary recruitment efforts for both the CSE Ph.D. and master's program are conducted through the College of Engineering, which manages major recruitment efforts for all Engineering programs. CSE indicated that it attends several in-person conferences as part of its recruitment efforts, e.g., Grace Hopper Celebration of Women in Computing and the Tapia Celebration of Diversity in Computing Conference.

CSE's master's degree admissions decisions are made by CSE's Masters Chair with help and support from the Graduate Recruitment Coordinator in the Office of Recruitment and Admissions in the College of Engineering and CSE's Graduate Programs Coordinator. The guidelines and requirements on the CSE website¹⁴, are used to review applications. GRE scores were not required for the Fall 2022 or 2023 master's program admissions cycles. Sequential undergraduate/Masters (SUG) admissions decisions are made by CSE's Masters Chair with support from CSE's Graduate Programs Coordinator, based on established criteria as to GPA, courses taken and letters of recommendation.

¹³ See 45 C.F.R. § 618.300-455

¹⁴ <https://cse.engin.umich.edu/academics/graduate/admissions/>

For Doctoral Admissions, the CSE Ph.D. Admissions Committee (made up of faculty representatives from each of the lab areas within the division as well as the CSE Graduate Programs Coordinator/Manager, Financial Aid Coordinator, and graduate student representative) employs the guidelines and requirements on the CSE website to review applications. For the 2022-2023 admissions cycle, GRE scores were not included in the admissions review of Ph.D. applications. CSE faculty also review Ph.D. applications based on research area and indicated faculty advisors of interest and make evaluations. Faculty make offers on specific applicants, and these offers are reviewed by the CSE Ph.D. Admissions Committee. Applicants with offers must be evaluated by a committee member from an area outside that of the recommending faculty.

CSE identified several outreach activities now incorporated into their tenure track faculty search processes. All faculty on search committees attend the Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE) workshop on avoiding bias in hiring.

The number of female tenure track faculty members hired in 2022 was the highest since 2017, and a significant improvement over 2021 when no female tenure track faculty were hired. CSE requests statements from candidates about their contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI).

NSF Recommendation: NSF notes that the application and acceptance rates for women to the SUG Master's program are lower than the Master's program application and acceptance rates, especially for those pursuing a Masters of Science in Engineering degree. We encourage CSE to explore why women appear to be matriculating into this program at lower rates.

Promising Practice: CSE's DEI Committee publishes comprehensive annual and other reports on its dedicated webpage, with statistics and DEI related information regarding undergraduate enrollment and course participation; graduate recruiting, applications, admissions, and degree completion; and faculty recruiting and hiring. The reports, highly accessible and transparent, contain commentary about what has changed in CSE since last year from a DEI perspective and discuss possible rationales for changes.

A team of CSE course instructors launched Renew-CS¹⁵, an ongoing initiative to increase the number of women studying computing by improving the incoming student experience. Primary introductory courses in computer science at the University were added, guided and intensive labs for students new to the discipline were introduced, and a semester-long student mentorship program was launched. Mentors receive mentorship training, and training on how to run a successful help session. The program is also developing free, interactive CS e-textbooks, which are a resource that mentors can utilize during help sessions.

NSF Finding: *In Compliance*

¹⁵ <https://sites.google.com/umich.edu/renewcs/home>

UM Response:

- a. The difference in acceptance rate between SUGS and the regular Master's program is due to the fact that these programs address different populations and apply different admissions criteria.
- b. SUGS – Undergraduate program. Students are admitted to the University of Michigan, then apply to the CSE program. There is a 100% acceptance rate into SUGS, thus it tends to be skewed more male than female due to the demographics of the applicant pool.
- c. The Master's program admits students directly into the program, so has different admissions criteria from the SUGS program. The lower acceptance rate (10%), results in higher female representation. Admits to the Master's program are selected from a world-wide applicant pool, while admits to the SUGS program are selected only from the University of Michigan undergraduate population. All qualified applicants to the SUGS program are admitted, so the demographics of the applicant pool and the selection criteria result in a different female representation in each program.
- d. CSE is attempting to increase female participation in every program. In addition to measures noted in the analysis above, it is taking several others that it expects to have the effect of broadening participation. For example, CSE's undergraduate enrollment management plan is reserving significant space for students who discover their interest in CS after entering College. At the PhD level, CSE has designated a number of fellowship slots for students meeting criteria formulated by the Rackham Graduate school to sustain academic excellence and inclusiveness and embrace diverse experiences.

D. Program Administration and Environment

NSF looked at CSE's program administration in a variety of specific arenas, including academic advising, research participation, classroom and lab experiences, and pregnancy and parental leave policies. NSF based this part of its review on Title IX regulations providing that a recipient shall not, on the basis of sex, exclude from participation in, deny the benefits of, or otherwise limit any person in any advantage or opportunity pertaining to academic, extracurricular, research, occupational training, or other education program or activity operated by the recipient.¹⁶ Such a denial can occur in the form of the creation of a hostile educational environment.¹⁷ Further, consistent with Title IX regulations, a recipient may not apply any rule concerning a student's actual or potential parental or marital status that treats students differently on the basis of sex. The regulations also require that pregnancy and childbirth be treated in the same manner and under the same policies as any other temporary disability or physical condition.¹⁸

¹⁶ See, Education programs or activities, 45 C.F.R. § 618.400(a), (b)(7).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. vi

¹⁸ See, 45 C.F.R. § 618.445 and 618.530, and 45 C.F.R. § 618.300(c)(3).

Analysis: In 2021, following well-publicized allegations of sexual misconduct involving certain CSE faculty, CSE undertook an independent climate survey of 823 students, faculty, and alumni. Student participants were asked whether they experienced any sexual misconduct from anyone at CSE over the past several years and 97% indicated they had not.¹⁹ Student participants were also asked if they believed CSE would respond effectively to a report of harassing behavior, and only 26% indicated that they were confident that the response would be effective.²⁰ Just 45% of faculty and staff indicated they were only somewhat or not confident.²¹

Also according to the survey, 41% of participants indicated that the CSE climate was not “sexist” and 53% agreed it was “safe,” and just over half agreed that CSE considers offensive language, jokes and behavior unacceptable.²² These percentages suggest that a significant portion of the participant population disagreed, meaning that much work to improve the climate needed to be done, a point with which CSE concurred and appeared to embrace. Now, nearly two years later, we received what could be described as “improved” responses from a vastly smaller sample of interviewees. On the question of whether CSE would respond effectively to reports of inappropriate behavior, the majority of those interviewed by NSF expressed optimism that CSE was moving in the right direction and taking concrete action to adjust processes, offer more resources, and foster a safer and more inclusive environment.

As required, the University’s policies cover faculty, students, and staff. For graduate students, all eligible graduate students will be granted a Parental Accommodation period of up to six weeks long immediately following the birth or adoption of a child. Graduate students who give birth will be granted up to eight weeks of Parental Accommodation. This period of accommodation is not considered leave but a modification of deadlines and academic expectations to accommodate the student’s new parental responsibilities. For faculty and staff, the University offers up to six weeks of paid maternity leave to support recovery from childbirth. Parents, including birth mothers who take maternity leave, are eligible for up to six weeks to bond with their newborns or newly adopted children. If a birth parent’s recovery exceeds the six-week period, the birth parent may be able to use extended or short-term sick leave, depending on eligibility.

NSF was told that for post-doctoral fellows, the University maintains a central fund to cover maternity or parental leave expenses, if the fellow’s sponsor or grant source permits.

Faculty, students, and staff interviewed reported that they were informed of the policies, and some had taken advantage of the policies or had a colleague who had utilized the policies. Pregnancy and parental leave policies for undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral students, and employees are easily accessible on the University and CSE webpages.

NSF Recommendation: CSE’s DEI Committee, comprised of faculty, staff and students, is charged with conducting assessments, leading community building activities, and recommending actions to improve CSE’s climate. The Committee has organized town halls, special-purpose

¹⁹ Results Report, *Toward the Future Survey*, Giffen & Kaminski, Attorneys at Law, August 2021, p.34.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Id.* at 37.

²² *Id.* at 14.

sessions and implemented graduate student check-ins. NSF encourages CSE to keep these avenues of communications open to maintain an ongoing understanding of community perspective. NSF also takes positive note of CSE's efforts to be transparent about its climate and environment issues, including its publication of the "Toward the Future Survey", the DEI annual reports, DEI Committee Reports, Town Hall Meeting notes and Graduate Student Check-In notes and would encourage that this continues.

Promising Practice: The Prevention, Education, Assistance and Resources (PEAR) office, a department within the ECRT office, is focused on promoting respectful environments and improving organizational climates by providing sexual and gender-based misconduct prevention education for faculty and staff. Faculty and staff leaders now have a dedicated resource to access advice about harassment related issues within their units and get customized recommendations based on the needs of their group. PEAR is also working on a sexual and gender-based harassment and misconduct prevention plan for the entire campus.

Taking modified duties or requesting a reduced appointment is an option for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members who may experience life events that lessen their ability to meet teaching obligations for a particular term or terms. Such events might include becoming a parent or taking on the responsibility of caregiving for an immediate family member, partner, or parent. An untenured or tenure-track faculty member may request a delay in the tenure review in recognition of the demands of caring for their newly born or adopted child or due to critical illness of the faculty member or their partner, child, or parent. Faculty members interviewed expressed appreciation for the existence of these policies and how they had been implemented.

NSF Finding: *In Compliance*

UM Response: The University concurs in the observations of the NSF. CSE continues with a robust and active DEI committee, with dedicated staff, that supports a broad portfolio of DEI activities. The Committee submits annual reports, holds community meetings, performs outreach for student recruiting, provides input and support for faculty and student recruiting, and organizes a variety of initiatives promoting community ties and student wellness.

IV. CONCLUSION

In a December 7, 2021, memo to the CSE community, the Division Chair acknowledged that trust within the CSE community had been broken due to allegations of sexual misconduct against several CSE faculty over the past couple of years. NSF heard a similar sentiment from a number of our interviewees, with many expressing unease about how CSE and University leadership handled these matters. The Division Chair further acknowledged that repairing trust would require sustained energy and resources, and, again, many of those interviewed by NSF drew similar conclusions.

It was evident that energy and resources were being applied and various initiatives undertaken by CSE and the University in response to the prior publicized issues in CSE and the larger campus. Many of these initiatives appear prudent and constructive, e.g., the reorganization of OIE into

ECRT, the establishment of the PEAR program, and CSE's concerted organizational climate activities. The CSE Artificial Intelligence lab in particular seems to be embracing opportunities for change, offering mentoring and coaching and teaming on innovations to encourage an inclusive environment.

Overall, based on our interviews, we observed a cautiously optimistic attitude regarding steps taken thus far. As one interviewee put it – “only time will tell whether these are meaningful changes or a check the box exercise.” As noted, our review was limited, and we intend to check back in with CSE and the University to monitor progress on our recommendations and to see how any promising practices are progressing. We look forward to the University and CSE demonstrating to the community that the changes they have made and the initiatives they have undertaken are indeed meaningful, and ultimately seeing community and campus trust restored.